arXiv:1407.7565v3 [math.GR] 17 Mar 2015

A restriction on proper actions on homogeneous spaces of a reductive type

Maciej Bocheński and Marek Ogryzek

March 19, 2015

Abstract

Let L be a reductive subgroup of a reductive Lie group G. Let G/H be a homogeneous space of reductive type. We provide a necessary condition for the properness of the action of L on G/H. As an application we give examples of spaces that do not admit standard compact Clifford-Klein forms.

1 Introduction

Let L be a locally compact topological group acting continuously on a locally Hausdorff topological space M. This action is called ***proper*** if for every compact subset $C \subset M$ the set

$$L(C) := \{g \in L \mid g \cdot C \cap C \neq \emptyset\}$$

is compact. In this paper, our main concern is the following question posed by T. Kobayashi [7]

How "large" subgroups of G can act properly

on a homogeneous space G/H? **(Q1)**

We restrict our attention to the case where $M = G/H$ is a homogeneous space of reductive type and always assume that G is a linear connected reductive real Lie group with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. Let $H \subset G$ be a closed subgroup of G with finitely many connected components and $\mathfrak{h}$ be the Lie algebra of H.

Definition 1. *The subgroup H is reductive in G if $\mathfrak{h}$ is reductive in $\mathfrak{g}$, that is, there exists a Cartan involution θ for which $\theta(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathfrak{h}$. The space G/H is called the homogeneous space of reductive type.*

Note that if $\mathfrak{h}$ is reductive in $\mathfrak{g}$ then $\mathfrak{h}$ is a reductive Lie algebra.

It is natural to ask when does a closed subgroup of G act properly on a space of reductive type G/H. This problem was treated, inter alia, in [1], [2], [4], [6], [9], [10], [12] and [14]. In [6] one can find a very important criterion for a proper action of a subgroup L reductive in G. To state this criterion we need to introduce some additional notation. Let $\mathfrak{l}$ be the Lie algebra of L. Take a Cartan involution θ of $\mathfrak{g}$. We obtain the Cartan decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} + \mathfrak{p}. \tag{1}$$

Choose a maximal abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a}$ in $\mathfrak{p}$. The subspace $\mathfrak{a}$ is called the ***maximally split abelian subspace*** of $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}) := \dim(\mathfrak{a})$ is called the ***real rank*** of $\mathfrak{g}$. It follows from Definition 1 that $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{l}$ admit Cartan decompositions

$$\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{k}_1 + \mathfrak{p}_1 \text{ and } \mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{k}_2 + \mathfrak{p}_2,$$

given by Cartan involutions $\theta_1,\ \theta_2$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that $\theta_1(\mathfrak{h}) = \mathfrak{h}$ and $\theta_2(\mathfrak{l}) = \mathfrak{l}$. Let $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subset \mathfrak{p}_1$ and $\mathfrak{a}_2 \subset \mathfrak{p}_2$ be maximally split abelian subspaces of $\mathfrak{p}_1$ and $\mathfrak{p}_2$, respectively. One can show that there exist $a, b \in G$ such that $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{h}} := \operatorname{Ad}_a \mathfrak{a}_1 \subset \mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{l}} := \operatorname{Ad}_b \mathfrak{a}_2 \subset \mathfrak{a}$. Denote by $W_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$. In this setting the following holds

Theorem 1 (Theorem 4.1 in [6]). *The following three conditions are equivalent*

1. *L acts on G/H properly.*
2. *H acts on G/L properly.*
3. *For any $w \in W_{\mathfrak{g}}$, $w \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{l}} \cap \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{h}} = \{0\}$.*

Note that the criterion 3. in Theorem 1 depends on how L and H are embedded in G up to inner-automorphisms. Theorem 1 provides a partial answer to Q1.

Corollary 1 (Corollary 4.2 in [6]). *If L acts properly on G/H then*

$$\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{l}) + \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{h}) \leq \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Hence the real rank of L is bounded by a constant which depends on G/H, no matter how H and L are embedded in G. In this paper we find a similar, stronger restriction for Lie groups G, H, L by means of a certain tool which we call the a-hyperbolic rank (see Section 2, Definition 2 and Table 1). In more detail we prove the following

Theorem 2. *If L acts properly on G/H then*

$$\mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{l}) + \mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{h}) \leq \mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Recall that a homogeneous space G/H of reductive type admits a ***compact Clifford-Klein form*** if there exists a discrete subgroup $\Gamma \subset G$ such that Γ acts properly on G/H and $\Gamma\backslash G/H$ is compact. The space G/H admits a ***standard compact Clifford-Klein form*** in the sense of Kassel-Kobayashi [5] if there exists a subgroup L reductive in G such that L acts properly on G/H and $L\backslash G/H$ is compact. In the latter case, for any discrete cocompact subgroup $\Gamma' \subset L$, the space $\Gamma'\backslash G/H$ is a compact Clifford-Klein form. Therefore it follows from Borel's theorem (see [3]) that any homogeneous space of reductive type admitting a standard compact Clifford-Klein form also admits a compact Clifford-Klein form.
It is not known if the converse statement holds, but all known reductive homogeneous spaces G/H admitting compact Clifford-Klein forms also admit standard compact Clifford-Klein forms.

As a corollary to Theorem 2, we get examples of the semisimple symmetric spaces without standard compact Clifford-Klein forms. In particular, we cannot find the first example in the existing literature:

Corollary 2. *The homogeneous spaces $G/H = SL(2k+1,\mathbb{R})/SO(k-1,k+2)$ and $G/H = SL(2k+1,\mathbb{R})/Sp(k-1,\mathbb{R})$ for $k \geq 5$ do not admit standard compact Clifford-Klein forms.*

Remark 1. *Let us mention the following results, related to the above corollary.*

- *T. Kobayashi proved in [8] that $SL(2k,\mathbb{R})/SO(k,k)$ for $k \geq 1$ and $SL(n,\mathbb{R})/Sp(l,\mathbb{R})$ for $0 < 2l \leq n-2$ do not admit compact Clifford-Klein forms.*
- *Y. Benoist proved in [1] that $SL(2k+1,\mathbb{R})/SO(k,k+1)$ for $k \geq 1$ does not admit compact Clifford-Klein forms.*
- *Y. Morita proved recently in [13] that $SL(p+q,\mathbb{R})/SO(p,q)$ does not admit compact Clifford-Klein forms if p and q are both odd.*

Note that these works are devoted to the problem of existence of compact Clifford-Klein forms on a given homogeneous space (not only standard compact Clifford-Klein forms).

2 The a-hyperbolic rank and antipodal hyperbolic orbits

Let $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be a system of restricted roots for $\mathfrak{g}$ with respect to $\mathfrak{a}$. Choose a system of positive roots $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}^+$ for $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Then a fundamental domain of the action of $W_{\mathfrak{g}}$ on $\mathfrak{a}$ can be define as

$$\mathfrak{a}^+ := \{X \in \mathfrak{a} \mid \alpha(X) \geq 0 \text{ for any } \alpha \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}}^+\}.$$

Note that

$$sX + tY \in \mathfrak{a}^+,$$

for any $s, t \geq 0$ and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{a}^+$. Therefore $\mathfrak{a}^+$ is a convex cone in the linear space $\mathfrak{a}$. Let $w_0 \in W_{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the longest element. One can show that

$$-w_0 : \mathfrak{a} \to \mathfrak{a}, \quad X \mapsto -(w_0 \cdot X)$$

is an involutive automorphism of $\mathfrak{a}$ preserving $\mathfrak{a}^+$. Let $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{a}$ be the subspace of all fixed points of $-w_0$ and put

$$\mathfrak{b}^+ := \mathfrak{b} \cap \mathfrak{a}^+.$$

Thus $\mathfrak{b}^+$ is a convex cone in $\mathfrak{a}$. We also have $\mathfrak{b} = \mathrm{Span}(\mathfrak{b}^+)$.

Definition 2. *The dimension of $\mathfrak{b}$ is called the a-hyperbolic rank of $\mathfrak{g}$ and is denoted by*

$$\mathrm{rank}_{a\text{-}hyp}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

The a-hyperbolic ranks of the simple real Lie algebras can be deduce from Table 1.

A method of calculation of the a-hyperbolic rank of a simple Lie algebra can be found in [2]. The a-hyperbolic rank of a semisimple Lie algebra equals the sum of a-hyperbolic ranks of all its simple parts. For a reductive Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ we put

$$\mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{g}) := \mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}([\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]).$$

There is a close relation between $\mathfrak{b}^+$ and the set of antipodal hyperbolic orbits in $\mathfrak{g}$. We say that an element $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ is ***hyperbolic***, if X is semisimple (that is, ad_X is diagonalizable) and all eigenvalues of ad_X are real.

A-HYPERBOLIC RANK		
$\mathfrak{g}$	$\mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{g})$	$\mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g})$
$\mathfrak{sl}(2k,\mathbb{R})$ $k \geq 2$	k	$2k-1$
$\mathfrak{sl}(2k+1,\mathbb{R})$ $k \geq 1$	k	$2k$
$\mathfrak{su}^*(4k)$ $k \geq 2$	k	$2k-1$
$\mathfrak{su}^*(4k+2)$ $k \geq 1$	k	$2k$
$\mathfrak{so}(2k+1,2k+1)$ $k \geq 2$	$2k$	$2k+1$
$\mathfrak{e}_6^{\mathrm{I}}$	4	6
$\mathfrak{e}_6^{\mathrm{IV}}$	1	2

Table 1: This table contains all real forms of simple Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ for which $\mathrm{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{g}) \neq \mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{g})$. The notation is close to [15], Table 9, pages 312-316.

Definition 3. *An adjoint orbit $O_X := \mathrm{Ad}(G)(X)$ is said to be hyperbolic if X (and therefore every element of O_X) is hyperbolic. An adjoint orbit O_Y is antipodal if $-Y \in O_Y$ (and therefore for every $Z \in O_Y$, $-Z \in O_Y$).*

Lemma 1 (c.f. Fact 5.1 and Lemma 5.3 in [14])**.** *There is a bijective correspondence between antipodal hyperbolic orbits O_X in $\mathfrak{g}$ and elements $Y \in \mathfrak{b}^+$. This correspondence is given by*

$$\mathfrak{b}^+ \ni Y \mapsto O_Y.$$

Furthermore, for every hyperbolic orbit O_X in $\mathfrak{g}$ the set $O_X \cap \mathfrak{a}$ is a single $W_{\mathfrak{g}}$ orbit in $\mathfrak{a}$.

3 The main result

We need two basic facts from linear algebra.

Lemma 2. *Let V_1, V_2 be vector subspaces of a real linear space V of finite dimension. Then*

$$\dim(V_1 + V_2) = \dim(V_1) + \dim(V_2) - \dim(V_1 \cap V_2).$$

Lemma 3. *Let $V_1, ..., V_n$ be a collection of vector subspaces of a real linear space V of a finite dimension and let $A^+ \subset V$ be a convex cone. Assume that*

$$A^+ \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} V_k.$$

Then there exists a number k, such that $A^+ \subset V_k$.

We also need the following, technical lemma. Choose a subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$ reductive in $\mathfrak{g}$ which corresponds to a Lie group $H \subset G$. Let $\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \subset \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{h}$ be the convex cone constructed according to the procedure described in the previous subsection (for $[\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{h}]$).

Lemma 4. *Let $X \in \mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]}$. The orbit $O_X := \mathrm{Ad}(G)(X)$ is an antipodal hyperbolic orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1 the vector X defines an antipodal hyperbolic orbit in $\mathfrak{h}$. Therefore we can find $h \in H \subset G$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}_h(X) = -X$. Since a maximally split abelian subspace $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ consists of vectors for which ad is diagonalizable with real values and

$$X \in \mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \subset \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{a},$$

thus the vector X is hyperbolic in $\mathfrak{g}$. It follows that $\mathrm{Ad}(G)(X)$ is a hyperbolic orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$
and $-X \in \mathrm{Ad}(G)(X)$. □

Now we are ready to give a proof of Theorem 2.

Proof. Assume that $\mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{l}) + \mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{h}) > \mathrm{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{g})$ and let $\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]}$, $\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]}$, $\mathfrak{b}^+$ be appropriate convex cones. If $X \in \mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]}$ then $O^H_X := \mathrm{Ad}(G)(X)$ is an antipodal hyperbolic orbit in $\mathfrak{h}$. By Lemma 4 the orbit $O^G_X := \mathrm{Ad}(G)(X)$ is an antipodal hyperbolic orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$. By Lemma 1 there exists $Y \in \mathfrak{b}^+$ such that

$$O^G_X = O^G_Y = \mathrm{Ad}(G)(Y).$$

Since $\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \subset \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{b}^+ \subset \mathfrak{a}$ thus (according to Lemma 1) we get $X = w_1 \cdot Y$ for a certain $w_1 \in W_\mathfrak{g}$. Therefore

$$\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \subset W_\mathfrak{g} \cdot \mathfrak{b}^+ = \bigcup_{w \in W_\mathfrak{g}} w \cdot \mathfrak{b}^+ \subset \bigcup_{w \in W_\mathfrak{g}} w \cdot \mathfrak{b}.$$

Analogously

$$\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]} \subset \bigcup_{w\in W_\mathfrak{g}} w\cdot\mathfrak{b}^+ \subset \bigcup_{w\in W_\mathfrak{g}} w\cdot\mathfrak{b}.$$

By Lemma 3 there exist $w_\mathfrak{h}, w_\mathfrak{l} \in W_\mathfrak{g}$ such that

$$\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \subset w_\mathfrak{h}^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{b} \text{ and } \mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]} \subset w_\mathfrak{l}^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{b},$$

because $W_\mathfrak{g}$ acts on $\mathfrak{a}$ by linear transformations. Therefore

$$\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \subset w_\mathfrak{h}^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{b} \text{ and } \mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]} \subset w_\mathfrak{l}^{-1}\cdot\mathfrak{b}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} := \mathrm{Span}(\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]})$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]} := \mathrm{Span}(\mathfrak{b}^+_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]})$. We obtain

$$w_\mathfrak{h}\cdot\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \subset \mathfrak{b},\ w_\mathfrak{l}\cdot\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]} \subset \mathfrak{b}.$$

By the assumption and Lemma 2

$$\dim(w_\mathfrak{h}\cdot\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \cap w_\mathfrak{l}\cdot\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]}) > 0.$$

Choose $0 \neq Y \in w_\mathfrak{h}\cdot\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]} \cap w_\mathfrak{l}\cdot\mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]}$. Then

$$w_\mathfrak{l}\cdot X_\mathfrak{l} = Y = w_\mathfrak{h}\cdot X_\mathfrak{h} \text{ for some } X_\mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{h},\mathfrak{h}]}\backslash\{0\} \text{ and } X_\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{b}_{[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]}\backslash\{0\}.$$

Take $w_2 := w_\mathfrak{h}^{-1}w_\mathfrak{l} \in W_\mathfrak{g}$, we have $X_\mathfrak{h} = w_2\cdot X_\mathfrak{l}$ and $X_\mathfrak{h} \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{h}$, $X_\mathfrak{l} \in \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{l}$. Thus $0 \neq X_\mathfrak{h} \in w_2\cdot\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{h}$. The assertion follows from Theorem 1. □

We can proceed to a proof of Corollary 2. For a reductive Lie group D with a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{d}$ with a Cartan decomposition

$$\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{k}_\mathfrak{d} + \mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{d}$$

we define $d(G) := \dim(\mathfrak{p}_\mathfrak{d})$. We will need the following properties

Theorem 3 (Theorem 4.7 in [6])**.** *Let L be a subgroup reductive in G acting properly on G/H. The space $L\backslash G/H$ is compact if and only if*

$$d(L) + d(H) = d(G).$$

Theorem 4 ([16])**.** *If $J \subset G$ is a semisimple subgroup then it is reductive in G.*

Proposition 1. *Let $L \subset G$ be a semisimple Lie group acting properly on $G/H = SL(2k+1,\mathbb{R})/SO(k-1,k+2)$ or $G/H = SL(2k+1,\mathbb{R})/Sp(k-1,\mathbb{R})$. Then*

$$\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{l}) \leq 2.$$

Proof. Because $\operatorname{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{g}) = 1 + \operatorname{rank}_{\text{a-hyp}}(\mathfrak{h})$ thus it follows from Table 1 and Theorem 2 that if L is simple then $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{l}) \leq 2$. On the other hand if L is semisimple then each (non-compact) simple part of $\mathfrak{l}$ adds at least 1 to a-hyperbolic rank of $\mathfrak{l}$. Thus we also have $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{l}) \leq 2$. □

Proof of Corollary 2. Assume now that L is reductive in G. Since the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}$ is reductive therefore

$$\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{l}} + [\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}],$$

where $\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{l}}$ denotes the center of $\mathfrak{l}$. It follows from Corollary 1 that

$$\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{l}) \leq k+1, \tag{2}$$

and by Proposition 1 we have $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}([\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]) \leq 2$. Note that

$$d(G) - d(H) \geq k^2 + 2k + 2.$$

We will show that if L acts properly on G/H and $k \geq 5$ then

$$d(L) < k^2 + 2k + 2. \tag{3}$$

Let $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}] = \mathfrak{k}_0 + \mathfrak{p}_0$ be a Cartan decomposition. From (2)

$$d(L) \leq \dim(\mathfrak{c}_{\mathfrak{l}}) + \dim(\mathfrak{p}_0) \leq k + 1 + \dim(\mathfrak{p}_0). \tag{4}$$

Also, if $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}([\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]) = 2$ then it follows from Table 1 that (the only) non-compact simple part of $[\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{R})$, $\mathfrak{su}^*(6)$, $\mathfrak{e}_6^{\mathrm{IV}}$ or $\mathfrak{sl}(3,\mathbb{C})$ (treated as a simple real Lie algebra). In such case

$$\dim(\mathfrak{p}_0) < 27. \tag{5}$$

Therefore assume that $\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}([\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]) = 1$ and let $\mathfrak{s} \subset [\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{l}]$ be (the only) simple part of a non-compact type. We have

$$\operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{s}) = 1. \tag{6}$$

It follows from Theorem 4 that $\mathfrak{s}$ is reductive in $\mathfrak{g}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{s}$ admits a Cartan decomposition

$$\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{s}} + \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{s}}$$

compatible with $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} + \mathfrak{p}$, that is $\mathfrak{k}_{\mathfrak{s}} \subset \mathfrak{k}$. We also have $\dim(\mathfrak{p}_s) = \dim(\mathfrak{p}_0)$. Since $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{so}(2k+1)$ we obtain

$$\operatorname{rank}(\mathfrak{k}_s) \leq \operatorname{rank}(\mathfrak{k}) = k.$$

Using the above condition together with (6) we can check (by a case-by-case study of simple Lie algebras) that

$$\dim(\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{s}}) < 4k. \tag{7}$$

Now (4), (5) and (7) imply that

$$d(L) < 5k + 1$$

for $k \geq 6$, and $d(L) < 33$ for $k = 5$. Thus we have showed (3). The assertion follows from Theorem 3.

References

[1] Y. Benoist, *Actions propres sur les espaces homogènes réductifs*, Ann. of Math. 144 (1996), 315-347.

[2] M. Bocheński, A. Tralle, *Clifford-Klein forms and a-hyperbolic rank*, Int. Math. Res. Notices (2014), DOI: 10.1093/imrn/rnu123.

[3] A. Borel, *Compact Clifford-Klein forms of symmetric spaces*, Topology 2 (1963), 111-122.

[4] F. Kassel, *Proper actions on corank-one reductive homogeneous spaces*, J. Lie Theory 18 (2008), 961-978.

[5] F. Kassel, T. Kobayashi, *Poincaré series for non-Riemannian locally symmetric spaces*, arXiv:1209.4075.

[6] T. Kobayashi, *Proper actions on a homogeneous space of reductive type*, Math. Ann. 285 (1989), 249-263.

[7] T. Kobayashi, *Discontinuous groups acting on homogeneous spaces of reductive type*, Representation theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras (Fuji-Kawaguchiko, 1990), World Sci. Publ., River Edge (1992), 59-75.

[8] T. Kobayashi, *A necessary condition for the existence of compact Clifford-Klein forms of homogeneous spaces of reductive type,* Duke Math. J. 67 (1992), 653-664.

[9] T. Kobayashi, *On discontinuous groups acting on homogeneous spaces with non-compact isotropy subgroups*, J. Geom. Phys. 12 (1993), 133-144.

[10] T. Kobayashi, *Criterion for proper actions on homogeneous spaces of reductive groups*, J. Lie Theory 6 (1996), 147-163.

[11] T. Kobayashi, T. Yoshino, *Compact Clifford-Klein forms of symmetric spaces revisited*, Pure Appl. Math. Quart. 1 (2005), 603-684.

[12] R. S. Kulkarni, *Proper actions and pseudo-Riemannian space forms,* Adv. Math. 40 (1981), 10-51.

[13] Y. Morita, *A topological necessary condition for the existence of compact Clifford-Klein forms*, arXiv:1310.7096, to appear in J. Differ. Geom.

[14] T. Okuda, *Classification of semisimple symmetric spaces with $SL(2,\mathbb{R})$-proper actions,* J. Differ. Geom. 94 (2013), 301-342.

[15] A. L. Onishchik, E. B. Vinberg *Lie groups and algebraic groups,* Springer (1990).

[16] K. Yosida, *A theorem concerning the semisimple Lie groups,* Tohoku Math. J. 44 (1938), 81-84.

Maciej Bocheński
Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,
University of Warmia and Mazury,
Słoneczna 54, 10-710, Olsztyn, Poland.
email: mabo@matman.uwm.edu.pl
Marek Ogryzek
Department of Geodesy and Land Management,
University of Warmia and Mazury,
Prawocheńskiego 15, 10-720, Olsztyn, Poland.
email: marek.ogryzek@uwm.edu.pl